

## RANGE OF THE GRADIENT OF A SMOOTH BUMP FUNCTION IN FINITE DIMENSIONS

LUDOVIC RIFFORD

(Communicated by Jonathan M. Borwein)

ABSTRACT. This paper proves the semi-closedness of the range of the gradient for sufficiently smooth bumps in the Euclidean space.

Let  $\mathbb{R}^N$  be the Euclidean space of dimension  $N$ . A *bump* on  $\mathbb{R}^N$  is a function from  $\mathbb{R}^N$  into  $\mathbb{R}$  with a bounded nonempty support. The aim of this short paper is to partially answer an open question suggested by Borwein, Fabian, Kortezov and Loewen in [1]. Let  $f : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a  $C^1$ -smooth bump function; does  $f'(\mathbb{R}^N)$  equal the closure of its interior? We are not able to provide an answer, but we can prove the following result.

**Theorem 0.1.** *Let  $f : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a  $C^{N+1}$ -smooth bump. Then  $f'(\mathbb{R}^N)$  is the closure of its interior.*

We do not know if the hypothesis on the regularity of the bump  $f$  is optimal in our theorem when  $N \geq 3$ . However, the result can be improved for  $N = 2$ ; Gaspari [3] proved by specific two-dimensional arguments that the conclusion holds if the bump is only assumed to be  $C^2$ -smooth on the plane. Again we cannot say if we need the bump function to be  $C^2$  for  $N = 2$ . We proceed now to prove our theorem.

### 1. PROOF OF THEOREM 0.1

For the sequel, we set  $F := f' = \nabla f$ . Moreover, since the theorem is obvious for  $N = 1$  we will assume that  $N \geq 2$ . The proof is based on a refinement of Sard's Theorem that can be found in Federer [2]. Let us denote by  $B_k, C_k$  ( $k \in \{0, \dots, N\}$ ) the sets defined as follows:

$$B_k := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : \text{rank } DF(x) \leq k\},$$

$$C_k := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : \text{rank } DF(x) = k\}.$$

Of course  $C_k \subseteq B_k$  and  $B_N = \mathbb{R}^N$ . Theorem 3.4.3 in [2] says that if the function  $F$  is  $C^N$ -smooth, then for all  $k = 0, \dots, N - 1$ ,

$$(1.1) \quad \mathcal{H}^{k+1}(F(B_k)) = \mathcal{H}^{k+1}(F(C_k)) = 0,$$

where  $\mathcal{H}^{k+1}$  denotes the  $(k + 1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure.

---

Received by the editors April 16, 2002.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 46G05, 58C25.

*Key words and phrases.* Smooth bump, gradient.

©2003 American Mathematical Society

Fix  $\bar{x}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N$  and let us prove that  $F(\bar{x})$  belongs to the closure of  $\text{int}(F(\mathbb{R}^N))$ . Since it is well known that  $0 \in \text{int}(F(\mathbb{R}^N))$  (see Wang [6]), we can assume that  $F(\bar{x}) \neq 0$ . Our proof begins with the following lemma.

**Lemma 1.1.** *There exists a neighbourhood  $\mathcal{V}$  of  $F(\bar{x})$  relative to  $F(\mathbb{R}^N)$  and an integer  $\bar{k} \in \{1, \dots, N\}$  such that for any  $x \in F^{-1}(\mathcal{V})$ ,  $\text{rank } DF(x) \leq \bar{k}$  and there exists a sequence  $(v_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $\mathcal{V}$  which converges to  $F(\bar{x})$  such that*

$$(1.2) \quad F^{-1}(v_n) \subseteq \text{int}(C_{\bar{k}}).$$

*Proof.* Let us fix  $V$  an open neighbourhood of  $F(\bar{x})$  relative to  $F(\mathbb{R}^N)$  and denote by  $k_0$  the max of the  $k$ 's in  $\{0, 1, \dots, n\}$  which satisfy  $V \cap F(C_k) \neq \emptyset$ .

First of all we remark that  $k_0 > 0$ . As a matter of fact, suppose that for any  $k \geq 1$ ,  $V \cap F(C_k) = \emptyset$ , that is, for any  $y$  in  $F^{-1}(V)$ ,  $\text{rank } DF(y) = 0$ . Since  $F^{-1}(V)$  is open this implies that  $F$  is constant on  $F^{-1}(V)$  and hence that  $F(\bar{x})$  is isolated in  $F(\mathbb{R}^N)$ . So, we get a contradiction by arc-connectedness of  $F(\mathbb{R}^N)$  (and since  $F(\bar{x}) \neq 0$  and  $0 \in F(\mathbb{R}^N)$ ). Consequently, we deduce that there exists  $y \in \mathbb{R}^N$  such that  $F(y) \in V$  and  $\text{rank } DF(y) = k_0 > 0$ . Furthermore for all  $z \in F^{-1}(V)$ ,  $\text{rank } DF(z) \leq k_0$ . Hence by lower semicontinuity of  $z \mapsto \text{rank } DF(z)$ , this implies that  $\text{rank } DF$  is constant in a neighbourhood of  $y$  (because  $\{z : \text{rank } DF(z) \geq k_0\}$  is open). Therefore, by the rank theorem (see Rudin [4, Theorem 9.20]),  $V$  has the structure of a  $k_0$ -dimensional manifold near  $F(y)$ , and hence  $\mathcal{H}^{k_0}(V) > 0$ . Thus by (1.1),  $V \setminus F(B_{k_0-1})$  is nonempty. We conclude that for any  $v$  in the latter set,

$$F(z) = v \implies \text{rank } DF(z) = k_0;$$

in addition  $z$  has a neighbourhood on which  $\text{rank } DF \leq \bar{k}$  by choice of  $\bar{k}$ , and the set where  $\text{rank } DF \geq \bar{k}$  is open. Consequently such a  $v$  satisfies  $F^{-1}(v) \subseteq \text{int}(C_{\bar{k}})$ . Repeating this argument with a decreasing sequence on neighbourhoods, we get a decreasing sequence of  $k_0$ -values in  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  which has to be stationary. Hence the proof is easy to complete.  $\square$

We now claim the following lemma.

**Lemma 1.2.** *The constant of Lemma 1.1 satisfies  $\bar{k} = N$ .*

*Proof.* Let us remark that since  $F = f' = \nabla f$ , the Jacobian of  $F$  at any point  $y$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N$  is actually the Hessian of the function  $f$ . We argue by contradiction and so we assume that  $\bar{k} < N$ .

By the previous remark, for any  $y \in \mathbb{R}^N$ ,  $DF(y)$  is a symmetric matrix, the nontrivial vector subspaces  $\text{Ker } DF(y)$  and  $\text{Im } DF(y)$  are orthogonal, and  $DF(y)$  induces an automorphism on  $\text{Im } DF(y)$ . Let us fix  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . By Lemma 1.1 and by the constant rank theorem (see for instance Spivak [5] page 65) we deduce that  $M_n := \{y : F(y) = v_n\}$  is a submanifold of  $\mathbb{R}^N$  of dimension  $N - k$  and at least  $C^2$ -smooth (since  $F$  is  $C^N$ -smooth and  $N \geq 2$ ). Furthermore since  $f$  is a bump,  $M_n$  is a compact submanifold.

Now since  $M_n$  is a  $C^2$  submanifold of  $\mathbb{R}^N$  there exists an open tubular neighbourhood  $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{V}$  of  $M_n$  and a  $C^2$ -smooth function  $r : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow M_n$  which is the projection on the set  $M_n$  such that for any  $x \in \mathcal{U}$ ,  $x - r(x) \in N_{r(x)}M_n$ , where for any  $p \in M_n$ ,  $N_pM_n$  denotes the normal space of  $M_n$  at  $p$ . In addition, from the properties of the constant  $\bar{k}$ , by reducing  $\mathcal{U}$  if necessary, we can assume that for

any  $x \in \mathcal{U}$ ,  $\text{rank } DF(x) = \bar{k}$ . We set the following function on the neighbourhood  $\mathcal{U}$ :

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi : \mathcal{U} &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N, \\ x &\mapsto DF(r(x))(x - r(x)).\end{aligned}$$

We now need the following result.

**Lemma 1.3.** *If  $M_n$  is a compact  $C^2$  submanifold of  $\mathbb{R}^N$ , then for all  $\xi$  in the unit sphere  $\mathbb{S}^{N-1}$ , there exists  $p \in M_n$  such that  $\xi \in N_p M_n$ .*

*Proof.* Consider for any  $l \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $p_l := \text{proj}_{M_n}(l\xi)$ , where  $\text{proj}_{M_n}(\cdot)$  denotes the projection map on the closed set  $M_n$ . Since the submanifold  $M_n$  is  $C^2$ , the vector  $\frac{l\xi - p_l}{\|l\xi - p_l\|}$  belongs to  $N_{p_l} M_n$ . Moreover by compactness of  $M_n$  we can assume that  $p_l \rightarrow \bar{p}$  when  $l$  tends to infinity. Now since the sequence  $(p_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$  is bounded, we have that  $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{l\xi - p_l}{\|l\xi - p_l\|} = \xi$ . By continuity of the normal bundle  $NM_n$ , we easily conclude that  $\xi \in N_{\bar{p}} M_n$ .  $\square$

Returning to the proof of Lemma 1.2, Lemma 1.3 immediately implies that for all  $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$ , there exists  $p \in M_n$  and  $v \in N_p M_n$  such that  $v = \xi$ . Furthermore the map  $DF(p)$  is an automorphism on  $N_p M_n$ , hence there exists  $w \in N_p M_n$  such that  $DF(p)(w) = v$ . We conclude that for any  $t$  small enough (s.t.  $p + tw \in \mathcal{U}$ ),  $DF(p)(tw) = t\xi$  and hence that  $\Phi(p + tw) = t\xi$ . Furthermore since  $M_n$  is compact and since the map  $p \mapsto [DF(p)|_{N_p M_n}]^{-1}$  is continuous on  $M_n$ , we deduce that  $\|w\|$  is bounded above. Hence by compactness on  $M_n$ , we get that for some  $t_0 > 0$  the ball  $B(0, t_0)$  is included in  $\Phi(\mathcal{U})$ ; hence  $\Phi(\mathcal{U})$  has a nonempty interior. Therefore (since the function  $\Phi$  is smooth enough) Sard's Theorem gives us the existence of regular values of  $\Phi$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . So there exists  $\bar{y} \in \mathcal{U}$  such that  $\text{rank } D\Phi(\bar{y}) = N$ . Consequently there exists  $\rho > 0$  such that the map  $\Phi$  is one-to-one on  $\mathcal{W} = B(\bar{y}, \rho)$  (the ball centered at  $\bar{y}$  with radius  $\rho$ ).

For any  $l \in \mathbb{N}^*$ , we set  $y_l := r(\bar{y}) + \frac{1}{l}(\bar{y} - r(\bar{y}))$ . The constant rank theorem implies that for any  $l$  the set  $V_l := \{y \in \mathcal{U} : F(y) = F(y_l)\}$  is a submanifold of  $\mathcal{U}$  of dimension  $N - \bar{k}$ . (Of course  $V_l$  might be noncompact in  $\mathcal{U}$ , i.e.  $\bar{V}_l$  not included in  $\mathcal{U}$ .) On the other hand, by Lipschitz continuity of  $DF(\cdot)$  and since  $N - \bar{k} > 0$ , there exists a neighbourhood  $\mathcal{Y}$  of the segment  $[\bar{y}, r(\bar{y})]$  in  $\text{co}\{\mathcal{W} \cup r(\mathcal{W})\}$  and a Lipschitz continuous map  $X : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$  such that for any  $x \in \mathcal{Y}$ ,

$$X(x) \in \ker DF(x) \text{ and } \|X(x)\| = 1.$$

If we denote by  $\theta_X(y, \tau)$  the local flow of the vector field  $X$  on  $\mathcal{Y}$ , we get that for any  $\tau$  small enough,  $\theta_X(y_l, \tau) \in V_l$ . On the other hand, Gronwall's Lemma easily yields the following (we omit the proof):

**Lemma 1.4.** *There exist two positive constants  $K, \mu$  such that for any  $l \in \mathbb{N}^*$  and for any  $\tau \leq \mu$ , we have*

$$(1.3) \quad \theta_X(y_l, \tau) \in \text{co} \left\{ B\left(\bar{y}, \frac{\rho}{2}\right) \cup r\left(B\left(\bar{y}, \frac{\rho}{2}\right)\right) \right\},$$

$$(1.4) \quad \frac{\|\theta_X(y_l, \tau) - r(\theta_X(y_l, \tau))\|}{\|y_l - r(y_l)\|} \in [e^{-K\tau}, e^{K\tau}].$$

We now conclude the proof of Lemma 1.2. We set for any  $l \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ ,  $z_l := \theta_X(y_l, \mu)$ . First remark that if  $\mu$  is small enough, then we have (recall that  $\|X\| = 1$ )

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \langle X(\theta_X(y_l, s)), X(y_l) \rangle \geq \frac{1}{2} \\
 \implies & \left\langle \int_0^\mu X(\theta_X(y_l, s)) ds, X(y_l) \right\rangle \geq \frac{\mu}{2} \\
 (1.5) \quad & \implies \|z_l - y_l\| \geq \frac{\mu}{2}.
 \end{aligned}$$

By considering a converging subsequence of  $(z_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  if necessary we can compute

$$\begin{aligned}
 \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F(y_l) - F(r(y_l))}{\|z_l - r(z_l)\|} &= \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F(z_l) - F(r(z_l))}{\|z_l - r(z_l)\|} \\
 &= \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} DF(r(z_l)) \left( \frac{z_l - r(z_l)}{\|z_l - r(z_l)\|} \right) \\
 &= DF(\bar{z})(\bar{\zeta}),
 \end{aligned}$$

where  $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} z_l = \bar{z} = r(\bar{z}) \in M_n$  and  $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{z_l - r(z_l)}{\|z_l - r(z_l)\|} = \bar{\zeta} \in N_{\bar{z}}M_n$ . We deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
 DF(r(\bar{y}))(\bar{y} - r(\bar{y})) &= \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} l(F(y_l) - F(r(y_l))) \\
 &= \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} l\|z_l - r(z_l)\| \frac{F(y_l) - F(r(y_l))}{\|z_l - r(z_l)\|} \\
 &= c\|\bar{y} - r(\bar{y})\|DF(\bar{z})(\bar{\zeta}) \\
 &= DF(\bar{z})(c\|\bar{y} - r(\bar{y})\|\bar{\zeta}),
 \end{aligned}$$

with  $c = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|z_l - r(z_l)\|}{\|y_l - r(y_l)\|}$ .

The computations prove that  $\Phi(\bar{y}) = \Phi(\bar{z} + c\|\bar{y} - r(\bar{y})\|\bar{\zeta})$ . Furthermore by (1.3) and (1.5),  $\bar{z}$  belongs to  $r(\mathcal{W})$  and  $\|\bar{z} - r(\bar{y})\| > 0$ . Consequently since  $\Phi$  is injective on  $\mathcal{W}$ , it remains to prove that  $\bar{z} + c\|\bar{y} - r(\bar{y})\|\bar{\zeta}$  is in  $\mathcal{W}$  to get a contradiction. By (1.4) taking  $\mu$  smaller if necessary, we get the result of Lemma 1.2.  $\square$

The proof of Theorem 0.1 is now easy. Since  $\bar{k} = N$ , for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  the different values  $v_n$  of Lemma 1.1 belong to the interior of  $f'(\mathbb{R}^N)$  and moreover the sequence  $(v_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges to  $F(\bar{x})$ . This proves the theorem.

## REFERENCES

1. J. M. Borwein, M. Fabian, I. Kortezov, and P. D. Loewen. The range of the gradient of a continuously differentiable bump. *J. Nonlinear Convex Anal.*, 2(1):1–19, 2001. MR **2002c**:58012
2. H. Federer. *Geometric measure theory*. Springer-Verlag, New York Inc., New York, 1969. MR **41**:1976
3. T. Gaspari. On the range of the derivative of a real valued function with bounded support. Preprint.
4. W. Rudin. *Principles of mathematical analysis*. McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1964. MR **29**:3587
5. M. Spivak. *A comprehensive introduction to differential geometry. Vol. I*. Publish or Perish Inc., Wilmington, Del., second edition, 1979. MR **82g**:53003a
6. X. Wang. *Pathological examples of Lipschitz functions*. Ph.D. thesis, SFU, 1995.

INSTITUT GIRARD DESARGUES, UNIVERSITÉ CLAUDE BERNARD LYON I, 69622 VILLEURBANNE, FRANCE

E-mail address: rifford@igd.univ-lyon1.fr